



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/751,220	01/02/2004	Christoph Gurtler	Po7936/LeA 35,365	1177
157	7590	04/18/2005	EXAMINER	
BAYER MATERIAL SCIENCE LLC 100 BAYER ROAD PITTSBURGH, PA 15205			TRAN. THAO T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

10

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/751,220

Applicant(s)

GURTLE ET AL.

Examiner

Thao T. Tran

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This is in response to the Amendment filed 1/3/2005.
2. Claims 1-23 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, and 20 have been amended.

Claim Objections

3. In view of the Office action of 10/6/2004, the objection of claim 21 has been withdrawn due to the Amendment made thereto.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1-2, 4, 6-7, 9-11, 16-17, 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wellner et al. (US Pat. 4,204,051).

Wellner teaches a coating, comprising organic polyisocyanate, polyfunctional alcohols (polyols), and catalysts (see abstract; col. 1, ln. 40-46; Example 14); wherein the polyfunctional alcohols have the hydroxyl groups blocked by an ortho-carboxylic acid ester, and the catalysts are acid catalysts or organic metal compounds (col. 6, ln. 59-68; col. 8, ln. 10-54).

Wellner further teaches that the preparation of polyurethanes carried out in solvents, including lacquer solvents such as toluene, xylene, or a ketone (see col. 9, ln. 17-22). Thus, Wellner also teaches the reaction occurring in the absence of water.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 5, 13, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wellner as applied to claims 1-2, 4, 11 above.

Wellner is as set forth in claims 1-2, 4, and 11 above and incorporated herein.

Wellner teaches the catalyst to be organic tin or zinc compounds, and specifically tin (II) ethyl hexoate (see col. 8, ln. 39-44). Although Wellner does not specifically teach the use of zinc (II) ethyl hexoate, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have employed zinc (II) ethyl hexoate as a catalyst and would have resulted in the same effects as using tin (II) ethyl hexoate.

8. Claims 3, 8, 15, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wellner as applied to claims 1, 6 above, and further in view of Iwamura et al. (US Pat. 5,962,588).

Wellner is as set forth in claims 1 and 6 above and incorporated herein.

Wellner does not teach the use of dihydrofuran or dihydropyran as the blocking agent for the alcohol component.

Iwamura teaches the use of 2,3-dihydrofuran as the blocking agent for the alcohol component (see col. 6, ln. 1-3, 24-29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to have employed dihydrofuran, as taught by Iwamura, as the blocking agent in the invention of Wellner, because Wellner teaches that the use of this blocking agent would be most effective when the hydroxyl groups are attached to a backbone of a C1-18 alkyl group.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 1/3/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Throughout the Remarks, Applicants contend that Wellner does not teach the polyurethanes prepared in the absence of water. However, as pointed out in paragraph 5 above, Wellner does teach the preparation of polyurethanes carried out in solvents, including lacquer solvents such as toluene, xylene, or a ketone (see col. 9, ln. 17-22). Thus, Wellner also teaches the reaction occurring in the absence of water.

10. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

Art Unit: 1711

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Iwamura is used to illustrate that dihydrofuran has been taught as blocking agent of the hydroxyl groups in the prior art. Thus, the combination of Wellner and Iwamura is proper.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thao T. Tran whose telephone number is 571-272-1080. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, from 8:30 a.m. - 5:00 p.m..

Art Unit: 1711

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Seidleck can be reached on 571-272-1078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tt
April 14, 2005


THAO T. TRAN
PATENT EXAMINER